DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 670 RC 011 432

AUTHOR Madden, J. Patrick
TITLE Rural Development and the Land Grant University. An Evaluation of Title V of the Rural Development Act of 1972 (The Executive Summary).
INSTITUTION National Rural Center, Washington, D.C.; Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park. Dept. of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology.
PUB DATE 1 Oct 77
NOTE 20p.
AVAILABLE FROM National Rural Center, 1828 L Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Services: Employment: *Federal Legislation: Federal Regulation: Federal State Relationship: Financial Support: Income: *Land Grant Universities: Natural Resources: Objectives: *Pilot Projects: Program Development: *Program Evaluation: *Rural Development: Rural Economics: Rural Extension: *State Programs
IDENTIFIERS Puerto Rico: *Rural Development Act 1972 Title V

ABSTRACT

The land grant universities have, for the most part, performed the organizational and procedural processes stipulated by Title V of the Rural Development Act of 1972 and have succeeded in helping rural people satisfy high priority needs, thereby demonstrating that Title V is a valid approach to rural development. The three-year pilot period, ending with fiscal year 1976, was successful despite an 80% reduction in funding (from $45 million to $9 million). The 50 states and Puerto Rico initiated well over 900 Title V projects, including more than 300 aimed at improving income and employment, nearly 500 focusing on community services and facilities, and more than 100 addressing environmental and natural resource concerns. While the extreme diversity of projects and the high success rate were notable, states varied widely in their attainment of project goals. Factors affecting outcome were in-kind contributions by the university, support from other funding sources, and prior involvement of the university in rural development activities. Amount of funding was not a crucial factor, since states with equal funding produced different results. The data suggest that there is no one best way to carry out rural development programs: rather, the advantage of the Title V structure is the flexibility allowed states to adapt procedures to suit local needs. (JH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

NRC NATIONAL RURAL CENTER | 1828 L St. N.W. • Washington D.C. 20036 • 202/331-0258
Offices in Atlanta, Georgia and Austin, Texas

ED180670

JUN 1979
ERIC CRESS
RECEIVED

RURAL DEVELOPMENT AND THE LAND GRANT UNIVERSITY

An Evaluation of Title V

of the Rural Development Act of 1972

(The Executive Summary)

National Rural Center
1828 L. St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

and

The Pennsylvania State University
Department of Agricultural Economics
and Rural Sociology
University Park, PA 16802

J. Patrick Madden
Principal Investigator

October 1, 1977

Ce 011432

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Victoria J. Hays

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Abstract

Title V of the Rural Development Act of 1972 calls on the nation's land grant universities to help rural people attain their development goals by establishing linkages among research, extension, government agencies, and rural people. Title V and its federal regulations stipulate that the major land grant university in each state (plus Univ. of Puerto Rico) must use certain *processes*, that is, it must follow a series of organizational and procedural practices in conducting its Title V program. The Congress has also indicated the kinds of *end products* or outcomes that state Title V programs should seek to attain. Therefore, Title V programs have been evaluated in terms of both general categories of criteria: the processes used and the end products achieved.

- *In general the conclusion of this evaluation is that Title V has been demonstrated to be a viable approach to rural development.*

The land grant universities have, for the most part, shown their willingness and ability to perform the organizational and procedural processes stipulated in the law and the regulations in working toward the overall objectives of Title V. And, despite receiving only a fraction of the funds originally anticipated, the states and Puerto Rico have succeeded in helping many rural citizens in selected parts of the country attain some of their high priority needs, including better housing, water and sewerage facilities, jobs, and health services.

What is Expected of Title V?

Specifically, the Title V program within each state (and Puerto Rico) is expected to accomplish the following purposes:

- provide information and assist in the interpretation and application of information needed by various public and private agencies and decision makers involved with achieving the various development objectives or end products -- particularly those related to improving public services, employment opportunities and incomes

- provide research and investigations useful to those planning, carrying out, managing, or investing in facilities, services, businesses, or other enterprises (both public and private) that may contribute to rural devlopment; and

- enhance the capabilities of various colleges and universities in each state to perform vital public service roles of research and practical application of knowledge in support of rural development.

In addition to focusing on these objectives and *end products*, the law and its accompanying regulations are explicit in requiring each state program to include certain *processes* related to the way the land grant university administers the program:

- A memorandum of understanding must be signed by the chief administrative officer of the major land grant university and the Secretary of Agriculture.

- An official is to be designated by the chief administrative officer of the administering university to provide overall coordination of planning, organizing, funding, conducting, and evaluating the state's Title V program.

- The Directors of Cooperative Extension and of the Agricultural Experiment Station must administer the extension and research components of the state's Title V program, in cooperation with the chief administrative officer of the land grant university.

- Each year a plan of work must be approved by the Secretary of Agriculture; it must stipulate the geographic and/or problem area within which Title V is to operate. This area should be limited to a scope attainable within the three years of the pilot stage of Title V. Emphasis is to be given to rural areas and cities with population under 50,000.

- The administering university is expected to collaborate with other institutions of higher education, including the land grant colleges of 1890, in conducting the Title V programs. The arrangements made to provide this collaboration are to be specified in the plan of work.

- The interconnectons between research and extension activities must also be indicated in the plan of work.

- The plan of work is expected to include provision for evaluating the impact of each project including appraisals by local leaders.

- A report of progress must be submitted each year.

The objectives and processes embodied in Title V were designed with a specific funding level in mind -- $10 million the first year, $15 million the second, and $20 million the third -- a total of $45 million during the three-year pilot phase. After the third year, the program was to be evaluated to determine whether it should be amended and/or extended and expanded. The three-year pilot phase was completed at the end of fiscal year 1976. During this pilot phase, the program received only one fifth of the $45 million authorized -- $9 million over three years. Eight states received less than $10,000 a year for Title V research and the same amount for the extension component of their program. Only a dozen states received as much as $40,000 a year for each of the two components. It seems somewhat incongruous to evaluate a $9 million program against $45 million expectations. However, it is realistic to evaluate the processes used by the land grant universities, to see if they were reasonably consistent with the law and

the regulations, taking into account the limited funding. It is also reasonable to expect that during the three years many of the state programs should have attained at least a few of the development objectives of rural people.

With this perspective in mind, at the end of the pilot stage, U. S. Department of Agriculture entered into a cooperative agreement with the National Rural Center (NRC), a private non-profit organization in Washington, D. C., to conduct an external evaluation of the program. NRC retained Dr. Patrick Madden of The Pennsylvania State University to head the evaluation project.

To carry out the project, Dr. Madden and NRC recruited a staff which was housed at Penn State but was employed fully by NRC. In addition, other NRC personnel, including its President, Vice President and Director of Public Information, were continually involved in the planning, implementation and writing of the evaluation report. Additional in-kind support was provided by Penn State University, in terms of faculty and clerical salaries.

The Findings in Brief

Each state Title V program is composed of one or more (usually many) projects. The end products reported by the states as outcomes of these projects were reviewed as part of this evaluation. Briefly, here are the findings:

- *The information collected from the 50 states and Puerto Rico indicate that Title V has been effective in helping rural people identify and attain a wide range of goals.*

- *Several kinds of services and facilities (such as health, housing, water, and sewerage) have been provided by projects in which Title V has provided essential information and expertise.*

- *For example, important progress has been made toward increasing the income and employment opportunities in many rural areas. For example, many projects have reported helping new or expanded firms create jobs for as many as a dozen persons -- a few have employed over 200.*

- *Natural and environmental resources have been protected and improved through projects such as the creation of a park or a recreation area.*

- *Though not all the efforts undertaken by Title V programs have succeeded, the high incidence of positive outcomes indicates that the basic approach of Title V is valid.*

Information reported by the land grant universities indicates they have generally incorporated the several mandated processes into their Title V programs. Many reported specific ways in which Title V has enhanced the

capacity of the land grant and other institutions of higher education to perform useful research and provide information services for rural development. In many cases, the capacity of rural communities to solve their own problems has also been enhanced. This has been accomplished through leadership training and the formation of new or improved linkages among the communities, the land grant university, other institutions of higher learning, and many public agencies and private groups. And while the organizational and administrative processes used by the land grant institutions in conducting the program have been basically in keeping with the spirit and the letter of the law, the states have suggested several changes in the law and the regulations, based on their first three years of Title V experience. They have also reported major lessons and conclusions drawn from their experience, among them the following:

- *The land grant universities have, for the most part, shown they can create and operate the organizational and administrative structures required by the law.*

- *States report a central lesson learned during the first three years of Title V to be that local residents and public officials must be involved in identifying problems and setting priorities on the kinds of projects to be initiated. States have emphasized further the need to educate citizens in the rural development process; to develop specific, realistic objectives; and to maintain momentum and widespread local support as the program continues.*

- *States have also emphasized the need to use integrated research and extension effort throughout the program. Title V seems to have sensitized many agricultural college personnel to the importance of linking research and extension in attempting to solve rural problems.*

- *Some states have reported, however, that the university "rewards system" seems to discourage researchers from engaging in Title V projects. Many researchers regard Title V's short-term applied research as less likely than other kinds of research to yield the professional journal publications necessary for advancement within the universities.*

- *Many states suggested that the State Rural Development Advisory Council (SRDAC) be dissolved and replaced with other established advisory committees. This suggestion seems particularly appropriate in states where the Title V allocation is rather meager, and/or where an alternative advisory structure seems to be functioning effectively. However, the experience of a few states has shown the the SRDAC can be a valuable asset, particularly in selecting problems and geographic areas on which the program can most meaningfully focus.*

- *The data do not support the contention that there is a single "best" structure for operational leadership that would lead inevitably to program success under all circumstances.*

- *Likewise, it is not possible to determine the "best" rural development approach, the "best" method for target area selection, or the "best" kind of target area for all states and all circumstances. Rather the advantage to the Title V structure is the flexibility given to states to decide these matters according to what best fits their particular university or local structure.*

- *Many states were able to multiply the total resources available by using Title V monies as "seed money" to help citizens obtain larger grants from outside agencies.*

- *Even with a very low level of funding, Title V has made many significant contributions toward making rural America a better place to live and work. However, several states emphasized that their contributions to Title V were made at an expense to other worthwhile research and extension programs; ten states indicated some degree of unwillingness to continue to operate the Title V programs if allocations remained at the level of the first three years.*

While the processes used by the states are an important focus of the law (and consequently of this evaluation), the ultimate test of Title V must be in terms of the end products or outcomes flowing from these processes. Therefore, the various projects conducted and their end-product outcomes are summarized here, followed by a more detailed discussion of the processes used to attain these outcomes.

Title V Projects and Their Outcomes

Many Title V projects concentrated on developing the skills of local agencies and citizens to identify and solve their own rural development problems and thus have not yet attained tangible outcomes or end products. Other projects, however, focused more directly on helping citizens attain those physical outcomes -- the new mobile home park, the water storage tank, the ambulance, the medical clinic, the youth center, *ad finitum*. Well over 900 projects are still active or have been completed during the Title V pilot stage; more than 300 projects were directed at improving income and employment; almost 500 focused on providing community services and facilities; and more than 100 addressed environmental and natural resources concerns. In addition, numerous "uncategorized" projects dealt with other rural development concerns. While not all these projects succeeded in meeting the original goals and objectives, those that failed produced lessons about what not to do in future efforts; these lessons may in themselves be considered valuable outcomes of the pilot program. The successes, in any case, far outweigh the failures, with results being both long and short term.

It should be kept in mind that these hundreds of Title V projects could not have been funded by Title V allocations alone. Programs located additional needed funds by using Title V resources as "seed money" and by stimulating universities, organizations and various government agencies to contribute to rural development projects. Outcomes of several of the projects completed during the pilot stage of Title V are summarized here.

Employment, Income and Human Resources

The Rural Development Act specified the improvement of income and employment opportunities as one of its central objectives. In meeting this objective, Title V programs carried out more than 300 projects related to employment, income, and human resource development. Many of these focused on analysis of rural economic potential. These projects assessed the existing and/or potential social and economic conditions of a selected area, so that many communities now have a planning capacity to attract new firms, and/or to help existing firms and businesses to expand. Other employment-related projects focused on public affairs leadership training and training for specific jobs. Management courses were conducted to train local rural people for operation of small firms such as a greenhouse, a book bindery, and a meat processing firm. Hundreds of rural citizens have acquired increased leadership and/or vocational skills.

Further employment-related projects involved efforts to expand or strengthen rural businesses. Title V assisted a few states in attracting new industry to their rural areas, and in other cases helped citizens avoid business enterprises that analysis showed to be economically perilous and/or ecologically damaging. Other projects helped develop or market new products -- as a result of one state's Title V program, kidney beans are now marketed as protein supplements for livestock; in another state an inventor was assisted in getting a patent on a new type of household door unit.

These projects illustrate the diversity of ways Title V has attempted to help rural communities make best use of local resources to encourage and speed economic growth in rural areas on a "self-earned, self-sustaining basis," as reflected in the expectations of Congress.

Community Services and Facilities

The second general category includes well over 500 projects that involved improving essential community services and facilities. Title V conducted more than 40 projects to help establish or extend water systems to rural communities, thus providing many rural residents with a standard, safe water supply for the first time. Fifty projects focused on sewerage and solid waste systems, enabling citizens to install, maintain, regulate and finance sewerage and waste facilities. Additional services projects assisted rural citizens in locating, renovating or financing better housing. Other projects focused on helping municipal or county governments improve financial management.

Additional projects, numbering more than 50, involved the improvement of recreational facilities. Outcomes included new parks, youth centers, and recreational master plans.

Projects have been instrumental in the creation of new bridges and roads; others have produced, for example, special information on transportation needs of the handicapped and elderly and a course in highway maintenance.

Employment, Income, and Human Resource Projects -- States with Title V Projects Still Active or Completed.

Project Type	States*	Count of States	Count of Projects
Development of new products	CA, KS, TN, WI	4	6
Attempts to help establish new firms or increase attractiveness of a local area to new industry	AL, AZ, CA, DE, GA, ID, IL, IA, KS, MD, MA, MS, NC, ND, OH, OR, TN, UT, VA, WI, WY	21	62
Expand or improve local firms or businesses	AZ,AR,CA,FL,GA,ID, IL,KS,MI,NV,NM,ND, OH,OR,PA,PR,TN,TX, UT,VT,VA,WI	22	43
Assistance to small farms	CA, FL, ID, MI, MS, MO, TN, VA, WI, WY	10	21
Development of cooperatives	AR, CA, MO, OH, PR, VA	6	6
Leadership training	AL, AK, AZ, CA, GA, ID, IL, IA, KY, MD, MI, MS, NH, NM, NC, ND, OH, PA, SC, VT, VA, WI	22	59
Welfare/transfer payments	GA, MI, OR, PA	4	4
Job training/employments skills, etc.	CA, DE, GA, IA, LA, MI, MS, NM, OH, PR, TN, TX, UT, VT, VA	15	23
Education	AL, CA, CO, CT, ID, KS, MI, MS, MO, NH, ND, OH, PA, RI, VT, WA	16	40
Other	AR, CT, FL, GA, IN, IA, KS, MS, MO, NH, NY, NC, OH, OK, OR, TN, TX, VA, WI	19	54

* See next page for key to state abbreviations.

Abbreviations of States and Puerto Rico

	STATE	ABBREV.		STATE	ABBREV.
1.	Alabama	AL	26.	Montana	MT
2.	Alaska	AK	27.	Nebraska	NE
3.	Arizona	AZ	28.	Nevada	NV
4.	Arkansas	AR	29.	New Hampshire	NH
5.	California	CA	30.	New Jersey	NJ
6.	Colorado	CO	31.	New Mexico	NM
7.	Connecticut	CT	32.	New York	NY
8.	Delaware	DE	33.	North Carolina	NC
9.	Florida	FL	34.	North Dakota	ND
10.	Georgia	GA	35.	Ohio	OH
11.	Hawaii	HI	36.	Oklahoma	OK
12.	Idaho	ID	37.	Oregon	OR
13.	Illinois	IL	38.	Pennsylvania	PA
14.	Indiana	IN	39.	Puerto Rico	PR
15.	Iowa	IA	40.	Rhode Island	RI
16.	Kansas	KS	41.	South Carolina	SC
17.	Kentucky	KY	42.	South Dakota	SD
18.	Louisiana	LA	43.	Tennessee	TN
19.	Maine	ME	44.	Texas	TX
20.	Maryland	MD	45.	Utah	UT
21.	Massachusetts	MA	46.	Vermont	VT
22.	Michigan	MI	47.	Virginia	VA
23.	Minnesota	MN	48.	Washington	WA
24.	Mississippi	MS	49.	West Virginia	WV
25.	Missouri	MO	50.	Wisconsin	WI
			51.	Wyoming	WY

Forty projects focused on rural health needs. These projects have, for example, helped citizens acquire resident physicians, organize and write grant proposals for the building of medical centers, set up emergency medical services and carry out preventive health care education.

Close to 70 other service projects focused on the improvement of local and regional government. Title V projects in the various states, for example, conducted workshops on writing grant proposals, helped citizens reorganize town management structures, and provided information on the use of intergovernmental contracts. Over 70 additional projects assisted with community or regional planning. Title V projects helped alert the local citizenry to the need for local resource planning and provided planners with information on land use, energy management, and fiscal policy. Other projects responded to law enforcement needs by working toward better protection of property, elimination of political intrusion in police management, location of funding for police, creation of neighborhood patrol systems and the development of contracting operations between county sheriff departments and townships.

Physical Environment and Natural Resources

Finally, in its other large category of projects some 136 focused on the physical environment or natural resources. More than 70 of these concerned land-use planning and zoning; through these projects, rural citizens developed a greater awareness as to the need for land-use planning. The projects also produced analytical tools which, in many cases, may be transferred for use in other communities. Further projects in this category involved the preservation of streams and management of woodlands; analysis of irrigation and ground water pollution; research studies of future water management, land resources, preservation of lands for agricultural use and control of urban growth. One soil modification project produced knowledge that could greatly increase the agricultural productivity of more than 100 million acres of farmland in various parts of the United States. Other projects developed ways to recover strip-mined lands.

Commentary on Projects

Certainly not all the hundreds of projects initiated by the states and Puerto Rico could be characterized as "successful" in terms of achieving the originally specified end products or outcomes. This is not surprising, given the realities under which the programs operated -- extremely limited Title V funding, a limited (three-year) planning horizon for the pilot program and dependence upon cooperation and funding decisions by various government agencies for initiation of many projects. What is surprising, perhaps, is the extreme diversity of projects that were completed and the many rural development activities that were enhanced through Title V. While some of these projects would have been completed eventually even without Title V, many were done sooner and more effectively because of Title V, through a combining of research and extension capabilities from various departments and colleges of the land grant universities and other institutions of higher learning. Many other projects would never have been initiated without Title V.

Services and Facilities Projects -- States with
Title V Projects Still Active or Completed

Project Type	States	Count of States	Count of Projects
Water Systems	AL,AR,DE,GA,KY,MD,MS, MO,NM,ND,OH,OR,PA,PR, TN,UT,WI	17	44
Sewerage and Solid Waste Systems	AL,AR,IN,KY,LA,MD,MI, MS,MO,NH,NM,ND,OH,OK, OR,WV	16	50
Housing	AR,CO,DE,FL,GA,IA,KS, LA,ME,MD,MI,NM,NY,OH, OK,PA,TN,TX,WI	19	43
Financial Services	AR,IL,LA,MO,NV,NM,VA, WV	8	12
Recreation	AL,DE,GA,IN,IA,KS,KY, LA,MI,MO,NH,NM,OH,OR, PR,TN,VA,WI	18	52
Public Transportation	AL,GA,IN,MD,MN,OH,PA, SC,WV,WI	10	13
Roads/Highways	IL,IN,KY,LA,MN,NM,NH, PR,WI	9	19
Health Facilities and Services	AR,CO,CT,DE,GA,IA,KS, MA,MI,MO,NM,OH,OK,OR, PA,SC,TN,UT,VA,WV,WI	21	40
Local and Regional Government	AK,AR,DE,IL,IA,MI,NH, NM,ND,OH,PA,PR,VA,WV,WI	15	66
Law Enforcement	DE,MI,NM,OH,VA,WI	6	8
Community/Regional Planning	AR,DE,GA,HI,IL,IN,KY, MA,MI,NH,NM,OH,OR,PA, VA,WI,WY	17	75
Fire Protection	KS,KY,NV,NM,ND,OH,OK, SC,UT,VA,WV	11	14
Other	AK,AR,HI,IL,IN,IA,KS, KY,LA,MN,MO,NY,OH,PA, PR,SC,TN,TX,UT,WI	20	39

Physical Environment and Natural Resource Projects --
States with Title V Projects Still Active or Completed.

Project Type	States	Count of States	Count of Projects
Soil	MO,OH	2	3
Forestry and Woodlands	GA, KS, MS, MO, NH, OH, UT, VA, WI	9	12
Water Management	AL, AR, MI, NM, OR, SD, UT	7	10
Stream Preservation	DE, MI, OH, TN, WI	5	5
Land-Use Planning and Zoning	AR, DE, IL, IN, IA, KS, MD, MI, MN, MO, NB, NH, NJ, NM, NC, ND, OH, OR, PA, SD, VA, WI	22	72
Mining	IL, IN, NH, OK	4	4
Natural Disasters	GA, KS, MD, OR	4	9
Other	AR, CO, IL, KY, MI, MS, MO, NY, OH, SC, VA	11	21

The wide variation evident among the states in their attainment of project outcomes is to some extent related to the level of funding received. Many states assert they could have attained far greater outcomes if more funds had been provided. While this seems highly plausible, the level of funding is not the only important factor. This becomes clear upon observing that among those states with extremely low funding levels (under $40,000 a year), some reported outcomes far beyond what could reasonably be expected, while others reported modest or even minimal outcomes. Likewise, some of the states receiving the larger Title V allocations reported very extensive project outcomes, while other states with equally large allocations accomplished much less.

Impressions gained during this evaluation are that the variations in outcomes attained with a given level of Title V funding are related to several factors; some factors lie within the control of Title V land grant university personnel, while others do not. One highly relevant factor that seems to vary considerably from one state to another is the extent of in-kind contributions by the university, and the success in obtaining support from other funding sources for projects requiring large capital outlays. Another salient factor is the background or history of rural development activities by the land grant universities. Some apparently already had extensive experience prior to Title V; many already had the administrative and organizational groundwork laid for conducting rural development projects, while others had to start almost from scratch. Some states reported they had been able to establish local advisory committees, create new faculty or staff positions, cooperate with other educational institutions, form linkages with various groups and agencies, and perform innumerable other processes necessary to the success of a rural development effort as envisioned by Title V. Others did not. A more comprehensive review of Title V processes will follow.

Evaluation of the Title V Processes

The Title V programs of all the 50 states and Puerto Rico fulfilled the requirements of the law and the regulations in nearly every respect. The several essential processes are discussed in this section.

Memorandum of Understanding

All the land grant institutions executed a memorandum of understanding, signed by their chief administrative officer and the Secretary of Agriculture.

Sources of Advice of Program Design

In each state a State Rural Development Advisory Council (SRDAC) was appointed, and in all but one state, the composition of the Council followed the basic requirements of the law. In a few states, the SRDAC was used extensively and its contributions to the program were reported to be essential. However, involvement of the SRDAC was rather perfunctory in most states; many reported that their Title V funds were so limited that the Council was involved only to set priorities and to approve the annual

plans of work. Members were typically involved during the program's formative stages and not in later project implementation. Many states reported that they were satisfied with the Council's role and did not wish it to take on additional responsibilities in administration or implementation of projects. Although states approved the concept of getting statewide advice, about one-third of the states suggested openly that the Council be dissolved and replaced with other established advisory committees. This suggestion seems particularly appropriate in states where the Title V allocation is rather meager and/or where alternative advisory structures seem to be functioning effectively.

Various sources of advice in addition to the SRDAC proved useful in the development of Title V programs. University advisory groups in 29 states helped define initial program directions and later advised on projects. Local citizens contributed to the selection of the target area in 16 states and to the direct selection of projects in at least 32 states. Further, all states report drawing on local advice some time during program implementation, either through formal channels like local committees or informal means like personal contacts with local leaders and citizens. Indeed, states report a central lesson learned during the first three years of the Title V to be that local residents and public officials must be involved in identifying problems and setting priorities on the kinds of projects to be initiated.

State Coordinator and Program Leadership

Among the several specific organizational arrangements required by the law and the regulations is the appointment of a State Coordinator. In a majority of cases, the State Coordinator was a person with much administrative responsibility within the college of agriculture or the overall university and had many responsibilities in addition to those related to Title V.

As a Title V administrator, the State Coordinator primarily coordinated university and outside agency inputs, chaired the SRDAC, helped delineate problems, and hired staff. The states seem to have adapted to local conditions by providing a diversity of roles for their respective State Coordinators.

The State Coordinators in most states were unable to devote much time to Title V leadership; another person or persons were usually chosen to be in charge of day-to-day operations. Regulations did not specify the kind of day-to-day leadership position that should be created. Across the 50 states and Puerto Rico, then, a predictably varied number of positions and structures were created in which one, two or several individuals were charges with day-to-day leadership.

Some states have argued that the best structure for the day-to-day operational leadership is to assign a significant block of professional time from one individual responsible for administering the budget and ensuring research/extension cooperation. The evidence suggests, however, two program leaders can achieve managing a coordinated program if they devote much time and a serious effort to coordination. In some states where the designated program leadership was able to devote very limited time to Title V,

a need for greater coordination was expressed. The fact that a variety of structures for program leadership appear to be satisfactory to those reporting on their programs may be attributed to many causes, including difference in the history of research-extension cooperation at the university, types of projects implemented, geographic dispersion of target areas, the personality and skills of the leadership and the natural biases of those reporting.

Thus, the data do not support the contention that there is a single "best" structure for operational leadership that would be superior under all circumstances.

The Directors

In every state the Directors of Cooperative Extension and the Experiment Station were involved, at least nominally, in administering the program.

Selecting Nature and Scope of Program

The principle land grant university in every state submitted a plan of work which stipulated the geographic and/or problem area to be addressed by Title V. However several states found that their initial plans of work were far too ambitious and had to be reduced to more realistic levels in view of the difficulties encountered and the limited funds received.

The land grant universities had considerable latitude in deciding how to approach rural development. The approach most commonly used was to assist citizens in tackling a critical problem directly. Other approaches, often used in conjunction with the first approach, were to stimulate the general citizenry to assume a greater interest in and responsibility for rural development problems, to educate local leaders, or to mobilize existing or new organizations to address rural problems. It is further possible to categorize the methods used for selecting target areas and to identify several kinds of target areas, including, for example, concentrated or dispersed geographic areas with emphaiss on local or statewide problems. What is not possible is to determine the "best" rural development approach, the "best" method for target area selection, or the "best" kind of target area for all states and all circumstances. Rather the advantage to the Title V structure is the flexibility given to states to decide these matters according to what best fits their particular university or local structure.

States did report several lessons concerning the definition of program nature and scope. These include (in addition to the critical needs to involve local people, mentioned above) the need to educate citizens in the rural development process, to develop specific, realistic objectives; to emphasize maintaining momentum and widespread local support as the program continues; and to use an integrated research and extension effort throughout the program.

Additional factors affecting the nature and scope of programs were resources available to Title V. Budgetary and staff constraints, for example, influenced desicions on which projects could feasibly be carried out. Many states were able to multiply the total resources available by using Title V monies as "seed money" to help citizens obtain larger grants from outside agencies, as, in one case, Title V produced an input-output analysis the provided partial justification for a Corps of Engineers project, and in another case assisted with a grant proposal to HUD for housing. Almost all universities, furthermore, seem to have contributed to some extent, and most quite generously, with office space, clerical help and faculty time. Many states contributed resources equal to or greater than the Title V allocation they received. Several states, however, emphasized that their contributions to Title V were made at an expense to other worthwhile research and extension programs, and that this contribution was not the result of extra money lying fallow at the university. Ten states indicated some degree of unwillingness to continue to operate Title V programs if allocations remained at the level of the first three years.

Integration of Research and Extension

One of the key factors in legislating a rural development program through the land-grant institutions was to develop and implement an integrated research-extension approach, utilizing the expertise of an academic community. The relationship between research and extension components of the program was generally specified in the plan of work. However, the working relationship between research and extension was not always a close one; in a few cases they seemed largely or entirely separate.

The potential for realizing research-extension integration is available on two levels: organizationally and functionally. In organizing a Title V program, one direct means for linking research and extension was to assign personnel with joint appointments to administer and operate the program. In a few instances new joint appointment positions were created specifically to provide this research-extension linkage. Almost half of the programs assigned personnel with joint appointments to fill the leadership positions. Many states created joint research-extension advisory committees to advise on the development and conduct of the program. Others created interdisciplinary task forces to carry out specific projects. Some states made one person responsible for both research and extension aspects of a project, even though that person might not have a joint research-extension appointment.

No definite conclusions can be reached on the basis of available data about the effectiveness of specific administrative or organizational procedures for integrating research and extension. However, the impression gained by examining the data is that administrators and program leaders in some states do, in fact, promote collaboration, while others do not. Factors that seem to be important to effective collaboration include the historical tradition of integrated research and extension activities, the way research and extension are related organizationally, and the personalities of persons in key leadership positions. For example, some program leaders seem to have such charisma and determination that they are likely to succeed in creating an atmosphere of cooperation almost regardless

of the administrative structure, while other personalities and historical relationships are so antagonistic that even the most positive administrative structures would be unlikely to bring about effective integration of research and extension.

One administrative factor within the university that had an important effect on the involvement of researchers in Title V programs was the "reward system" for promotion, pay increases, and tenure. In the view of some program leaders, Title V projects required one kind of research while the reward system required a totally different kind. In short, some researchers saw little possibility of Title V research leading to publication in major professional journals. Others, however, found that their Title V research efforts were professionally rewarding.

The integration of research and extension efforts can be readily observed by the extent of joint efforts in the conduct of projects and the degree to which projects contain activities lying at several points along a research-extension functional continuum. None of the projects reported under Title V appear to be strictly basic research activity, although there are numerous examples of projects -- particularly on employment, income, and human resources -- lying toward that end of the continuum. Various state programs report functional integration in at least some of their Title V projects, but the available data do not permit a rigorous determination of the full nature and extent of research and extension contributions to each state's program, or the extent to which research and extension efforts could be better integrated to more effectively achieve rural development objectives. Anecdotal evidence suggests that research and extension personnel in some states have not had a good working relationship, while other state programs are reported to have had traditionally good integration of research and extension.

In spite of the difficulty in assessing the actual extent of integration and cooperation, or the potential for further improvement, Title V seems to have sensitized many agricultural college personnel to the importance of linking research and extension in attempting to solve rural problems.

Involvement of Various Colleges and Universities

In addition to personnel affiliated with the Cooperative Extension Service or the Agricultural Experiment Station, the legislation encouraged the involvement of various colleges and universities in each state. Despite the low funding level and, thus, the severe budget limitations, the majority of states have reported considerable inter- and intra-university involvement. A large number of departments and over 100 institutions of higher learning, including most of the colleges of 1890, were reported to have participated in Title V programs. The data available to this evaluation do not reveal the nature or depth of the contribution each of these institutions actually made in designing and conducting the Title V programs. The involvement of some of these departments and colleges may have been rather perfunctory -- like serving on an occasional advisory committee, for example. The evidence indicates, however, that in many states meaningful cooperation has been achieved through Title V. All but three states reported involvement of departments outside the College of Agriculture. The participation of colleges and departments such as

Journalism, Anthropology, Political Science, Counseling and Testing, Theatre, Fine Arts, Nursing, History, Philosophy and Psychology gives an indication of the broad scope of the rural development effort in many states.

Most of the states that did not report any inter-university involvement received yearly Title V allocations for both research and extension programs of less than $30,000. However, the relationship between the size of a state's Title V allocation and the degree of involvement of other institutions of higher education is not strong -- some of the states reporting the most extensive cooperation had some of the smallest Title V allocations. One is left with the impression that organizational and administrative differences among land grant institutions account for much of the variation among states in the nature and extent of inter-departmental and inter-college cooperation.

Involvement of Agencies

In addition to academic faculty, the Title V programs were expected to coordinate their activities with the personnel from the numerous organizations and agencies, both public and private, that exist for the purpose of assisting in the solution to various problems facing rural America. Many states reported that Title V led to new or strengthened linkages. Only four states reported having no new or strengthened linkages with agencies.

At the federal level, 44 agencies or organizations with national scope are reported as having been involved in Title V projects. The federal agencies most frequently mentioned were Farmers' Home Administration (name by 25 states), the Soil Conservation Service (19 states) and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (17 states).

The number of state and regional agencies that cooperated with Title V project activities was also reported to be extensive. At the state level, those most frequently cited were planning agencies, and those involved with health, economic and community development, education, employment, and natural resources and ecology. Regional linkages were frequently made with planning and development councils as well as with councils concerned with health and aging.

Local agencies and local leaders were also frequently involved in Title V programs. A number of benefits were found to accrue from local participation. Local involvement seems to increase the likelihood that the problems addressed by Title V are relevant to the intended beneficiaries (local people) and that there will be an increase in the ability of local people to continue to solve their own problems after Title V leaves the area.

Reflecting on the experience of coordinating activities with other agencies and organizations, Title V personnel reported a number of "lessons," including: avoid duplication with other agencies' objectives, keep all interested and involved parties informed, pursue a shared and mutual goal, recognize the contributions of other agencies, and provide "lead time" for other agencies to plan programs.

Impact Evaluation

The state plans of work generally contained only a brief mention of plans for an analysis of the impact of each project and appraisals by local leaders. In view of the low funding level, the annual progress reports were administratively deemed to fulfill the intent of the regulations in regard to impact evaluation. Many of these annual progress reports were quite superficially prepared, while others reflect a serious effort to communicate what the Title V program accomplished. In addition, a few states used extensive means for evaluating project impact.

Overview

Title V has been demonstrated to be a viable idea. The land grant universities have, for the most part, shown they can create and operate the organizational and administrative structures required by the law. They have also exercised considerable creativity in going beyond the letter of the law to create additional mechanisms to enhance the effectiveness of their programs. The end products of the program, as reported by the states, have been diverse and impressive. Even with a very low level of funding, Title V has made many significant contributions toward making rural America a better place to live and work. While the available data do not provide any guarantee that substantially more Title V funds would bring forth proportionately greater outcomes, the outlook based on past performance is generally optimistic.

* * *

For further Information: A second report, soon to be issued by the National Rural Center, is Directory of State Title V Rural Development Programs. This report will contain a complete listing of projects, program personnel, and a brief narrative overview of each state's program.